

DETERMINING THE ORDER OF $SU(3)$ DECONFINING PHASE TRANSITION

Zheng-Kun Zhu

Department of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Drexel University[†]

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-9984

Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

and

Da Hsuan Feng

Department of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Drexel University

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-9984

Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37996

Abstract

An effective spin model for the finite temperature non-abelian lattice gauge theory is derived. The outcome is the surprising result that only nearest neighbor coupling survives, thus confirming the well known numerical results that the deconfining phase transition of the (3+1)-dimensional $SU(3)$ pure gauge theory is first order.

A major success of lattice gauge theory (LGT) is the numerical demonstration of a transition from the low temperature color confining to the high temperature non-confining phase[1]. Determining the order of the transition is a subtle matter. For the (3+1) dimensional $SU(3)$ finite temperature LGT, it was confirmed numerically on the $N_\tau = 4$ lattice (N_τ is the lattice size in the temporal direction) that the transition is first order[2, 3, 4]. More recent calculations on the $N_\tau = 6$ [4] also suggest that this is the case. Still, the definitive statement about the order of phase transition remains a challenge for the next generation of computers.

Apart from the full numerical determination the order of the finite temperature phase transition, there exists in the literature universality arguments, first suggested by Svetitsky and Yaffe in 1982[5], which relate the field theory to a simpler three dimensional effective spin model. The derivation of the effective spin model is highly complex. Nevertheless, by conjecturing a short range coupling, it was shown that the transition is also first order[3, 6, 7]. Although the conjecture may not be beyond reproach, these important results certainly lend confidence to the conclusion that the transition could indeed be first order. We therefore feel that there remain the urgent task of deriving an effective spin model. The purpose of this letter is to carry out the derivation.

Instead of directly studying the (3+1) dimensional $SU(3)$ finite temperature LGT, we will begin by studying a generic $(3+1)$ -dimensional $SU(N)$ LGT. The finite temperature behavior can be described by a partition function defined on a hypercubic lattice of size $N_s^3 \times N_\tau$,

$$Q = \sum e^S, \quad (1)$$

where S is the Wilson action

$$S = \beta_E \sum_n \sum_{\mu < \nu} \frac{1}{N} \text{ReTr}(U_n^\mu U_{n+\mu}^\nu U_{n+\nu}^{\mu+} U_n^{\nu+}), \quad (2)$$

β_E is the coupling constant, n and μ, ν represent the space-time coordinate and directions respectively. Finite temperature is introduced by imposing a periodic boundary condition in the time direction, with period N_τ . Accordingly, the temperature is $\frac{1}{N_\tau a}$, where a is the lattice spacing.

It is well known that the nature of the deconfining phase transition can straightforwardly be studied by constructing an effective theory (of the Wilson line) from the partition function in eq.(1) with all the link variables

integrated out except those for the Wilson lines. Then the effective action S_{eff}^W has the following form[8]:

$$S_{eff}^W = S_{eff}^W(\{\frac{1}{N}Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}\}). \quad (3)$$

Unfortunately, this process could only be carried out in the strong coupling limit.

There are two main obstacles to obtain S_{eff}^W . The first is that in eq.(2) there is no explicit Wilson line variable in S . The second is that it is very complicated to carry out the integration. We will now discuss the removal of these difficulties.

It turns out that by taking a thermal gauge choice[9] the first difficulty can easily be removed.

$$U_{\mathbf{n},n_\tau}^\tau = \mathbf{1} \quad (1 \leq n_\tau \leq N_\tau - 1)$$

The link $U_{\mathbf{n},N_\tau}^\tau$ remains unchanged, and the trace of $U_{\mathbf{n},N_\tau}^\tau$ becomes a Wilson line, relabelled here as $W_{\mathbf{n}}$. By inserting the above gauge choice into eq.(2), we can rewrite the action S of eq.(2) as a sum of S^g and S^τ , where

$$\begin{aligned} S^g = & \beta_E \sum_{\mathbf{n}, i < j} \sum_{n_\tau=1}^{N_\tau} \frac{1}{N} ReTr(U_{\mathbf{n},n_\tau}^i U_{\mathbf{n}+i,n_\tau}^j U_{\mathbf{n}+j,n_\tau}^{i+} U_{\mathbf{n},n_\tau}^{j+}) \\ & + \beta_E \sum_{\mathbf{n}, i} \sum_{n_\tau=1}^{N_\tau-1} \frac{1}{N} ReTr(U_{\mathbf{n},n_\tau}^i U_{\mathbf{n},n_\tau+1}^{i+}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$S^\tau = \beta_E \sum_{\mathbf{n}, i} \frac{1}{N} ReTr(U_{\mathbf{n},N_\tau}^i W_{\mathbf{n}+i} U_{\mathbf{n},1}^{i+} W_{\mathbf{n}}^+). \quad (5)$$

Straightforward removal of the second difficulty is arduous. To this end, we will instead effectively decouple the partition function into two independent sub-partition functions; one describes the Wilson line field and the other the space-like link field. We will then derive the effective spin model by means of a variational principle. In the following, we will show how to decouple the partition function.

First we will formally write the effective action as a sum of two parts: one is an effective spin model, the other has only space-like link variables[10].

$$S_{eff} \equiv S_{eff}^W(\{W_{\mathbf{n}}\}) + S_{eff}^U(\{U_{\mathbf{n}}^i\}). \quad (6)$$

where S_{eff}^W and S_{eff}^U are

$$S_{eff}^W = \ln\left(\frac{\sum_{\{U_{\mathbf{n}}^i\}} \exp(S^g + S^\tau)}{\sum_{\{U_{\mathbf{n}}^i\}} \exp(S_{eff}^U)}\right), \quad (7)$$

$$S_{eff}^U = \ln\left(\frac{\sum_{\{W\}} \exp(S^g + S^\tau)}{\sum_{\{W\}} \exp(S_{eff}^W)}\right). \quad (8)$$

We can now see that the partition function of the effective action given by eq.(6) is the same as that of the action given by eqs.(4) and (5),

$$\sum_{U,W} e^{S_{eff}} = \sum_{U,W} e^{S^g + S^\tau}. \quad (9)$$

In this way at least the decoupling of the fields W and U can formally be achieved. We can now see that W and U fields can be described exactly by S_{eff}^W and S_{eff}^U respectively. It should be noted that S_{eff} cannot describe the correlation between W and U . However, such a correlation is irrelevant for the physics discussed in this letter.

Of course, S_{eff}^W can in principle be obtained by integrating U in eq.(7). However as we have discussed earlier, it is highly complex to obtain S_{eff}^W by this approach. Instead we have resorted to the variational principle to derive S_{eff}^W . Since S_{eff}^U does not explicitly connect with the deconfining transition in our scheme, we will not comment on it further. Indeed, there is no loss of generality if we simply assume that it is already known.

The action S_{eff} resembles S except for the coupling between W and U fields. Therefore it is quite reliable to determine S_{eff}^W by a variational method[11] where S_{eff} is a trial action. To this end, we will first determine its form. We notice that there is a local gauge invariance for W in S of eqs.(4) and (5). Hence, in order to maintain this invariance, S_{eff}^W must only depend on $Tr(W^m)$ (where m is an integer)[12]. Then we can describe the action S_{eff}^W as follows:

$$S_{eff}^W = \beta_E \alpha \sum_{\mathbf{n},i} \text{Re}\left(\frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}+i} \frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}^+\right) + S_r^W\left(\left\{\frac{1}{N} Tr(W_{\mathbf{n}}^m)\right\}\right). \quad (10)$$

where α is a variational parameter. From eq.(5), we note that the first term of eq.(10) is the dominant part of the effective spin model and S_r^W the residue. What remains is to determine α and the form of S_r^W .

Ignoring the residue part in eq.(10) for the moment, we write the action as:

$$S_0^W = \alpha\beta_E \sum_{\mathbf{n},i} \text{Re}(\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}+i} \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}}^+), \quad (11)$$

then the trial action becomes

$$S_0 = S_0^W + S_{eff}^U. \quad (12)$$

To determine the value of α , we calculate the partition function as follows,

$$Q = Q_0 < \exp\{S^g + S^\tau - S_0\} >_0, \quad (13)$$

where $< \dots >_0$ represents the average in action S_0 and Q_0 is

$$Q_0 = \sum e^{S_0}. \quad (14)$$

Using Jensen's inequality ($< \exp X > \geq \exp < X >$), we can obtain

$$F = \ln Q \geq \ln Q_0 + < S^g + S^\tau - S_0 >_0 \quad (15)$$

and α can then be determined by maximizing F_{var} with respect to α

$$F_{var} = \ln Q_0 + < S^g + S^\tau - S_0 >_0. \quad (16)$$

To accomplish this, we will compute $< S^g + S^\tau - S_0 >_0$ ($\equiv K$):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K}{N_s^3} &= 3(\beta_E \text{Re}(< \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}}^+ \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}+i} >_{W_0} < \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(U_{\mathbf{n},N_\tau}^i U_{\mathbf{n},1}^{i+}) >_U) \\ &\quad - \alpha\beta_E \text{Re}(< \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}}^+ \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} W_{\mathbf{n}+i} >_{W_0})) \\ &\quad + \frac{< S^g - S_{eff}^U >_U}{N_s^3} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $< \dots >_U$ and $< \dots >_{W_0}$ represent the average in S_{eff}^U and S_0^W respectively. We then notice that S_0^W is real and invariant under the transformation

$$W \rightarrow W^+, \quad (18)$$

hence $\langle \frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}^+ \frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}+i} \rangle_{W_0}$ is also real. By maximizing F_{var} with respect to α , we obtain

$$\alpha = Re(\langle \frac{1}{N} Tr(U_{\mathbf{n}, N\tau}^i U_{\mathbf{n}, 1}^{i+}) \rangle_U) \quad (19)$$

We are now ready to determine the form of S_{eff}^W . Let's first write S_r^W as

$$S_r^W \equiv \xi S_r^{WM} \quad (20)$$

where ξ is a variational parameter and S_r^{WM} the remaining part of the effective action which is independent of ξ .

We notice that the action S of eqs.(4) and (5) is invariant if all the link variables U transform as $U \rightarrow U^+$ (here U means either U or W). To maintain this invariance in the effective spin model, S_{eff}^W must be invariant under the transformation $W \rightarrow W^+$.

Since S_{eff}^W is real and invariant under $W \rightarrow W^+$, $\langle \frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}^+ \frac{1}{N} Tr W_{\mathbf{n}+i} \rangle_W$ (where $\langle \dots \rangle_W$ represents the average in action S_{eff}^W), is still real. With this, we will again compute the partition function Q_{eff} in the action S_{eff} and K as:

$$K = \langle S^g - S_{eff}^U \rangle_U - \langle S_r^W \rangle_W, \quad (21)$$

By maximizing $F_{var} = \ln Q_{eff} + K$ with respect to ξ , we obtain

$$\langle \frac{\partial S_r^W}{\partial \xi} \rangle_W - \frac{\partial \langle S_r^W \rangle_W}{\partial \xi} = 0. \quad (22)$$

From eqs.(20) and (22), we obtain

$$\xi \frac{\partial \langle S_r^{WM} \rangle_W}{\partial \xi} = 0. \quad (23)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \langle S_r^{WM} \rangle_W}{\partial \xi} = \langle (S_r^{WM})^2 \rangle_W - \langle S_r^{WM} \rangle_W^2 \quad (24)$$

Clearly according to eq.(24), $\frac{\partial \langle S_r^{WM} \rangle_W}{\partial \xi}$ does not vanish unless S_r^{WM} is a constant, a situation which is not relevant in our discussion. From eq.(23), we see that ξ must vanish. Our derivation is general since S_r^{WM} includes any

kind of coupling terms. Hence surprisingly, we have obtained an effective spin model with only nearest neighbor coupling terms.

It is important to understand why by using the variational principle, the effective spin model appears simple. Actually, it is very complex in the sense that to compute α according to eq.(19) is complicated. The reason is as follows: In order to obtain α , we have to know the form of S_{eff}^U which can be obtained by integrating over W in eq.(8). With this knowledge, α can then be calculated according to eq.(19). Both procedures are nontrivial. In fact, the difficulty of deriving the effective spin model has actually been transferred from the integration of U in eq.(7) to the integration of W in eq.(8) and to calculate α from eq.(19). Therefore the simplicity of the form of the effective spin model is not obtained without a price. What we have done is to "organize" the theory such that the discussion of the order of deconfining phase transition can be vividly studied.

Having the effective spin model, we can now focus on studying the deconfining phase transition. To this end, we note that there were numerous investigation made in this direction already. These studies enable us to discuss the order of the deconfining phase transition.

For the $SU(2)$ gauge theory, it is well known that the plaquette is continuous with the change of β_E . Therefore, according to eq.(19), α is also a continuous function of β_E . Hence our study directly shows that the phase transition of the $Z(2)$ spin model possesses the same universality property as the $SU(2)$ gauge theory. This agrees with the recently reached conclusion by the Monte-Carlo real space renormalization study[13, 14].

For the $SU(3)$ gauge theory, it was shown via the Monte Carlo study of the effective spin model with a nearest neighbor coupling assumption that the transition is first order[1, 7]. Results reported here confirm the nearest neighbor assumption and are consistent with the recent Monte-Carlo results about the transition order[3, 6].

Finally, we mention that our derivation appears to provide an analytical approach to study the thermodynamical behavior of LGT[15].

We are very grateful to Lay Nam Chang, Xiangdong Ji, Robert Perry, Hai-Chang Ren and Yong-Shi Wu for illuminating discussions. We also thank N. Christ, M. Fukugita, S. Ohta and C. DeTar for several useful communications and suggestions. One of us (ZKZ) is very grateful for Center for Theoretical Physics of MIT for its hospitality. This work is supported by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy.

[†] Permanent address

References

- [1] See for example, A. Ukawa, Nucl. Phys., **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 118(1990);
B. Petersson, Nucl. Phys., **A525**, 237(1991).
N. Christ, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **20**, 129(1991).
- [2] F. R. Brown *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2058(1988); F. R. Brown, Nucl.
Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 214(1990);
S. Cabasino *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 218(1990);
N. A. Alves, B. A. Berg and S. Sanielevici, Phys. Rev. Lett.,
64, 3107(1990).
- [3] M. Fukugita, M. Okawa, A. Ukawa, Phys. Rev. Lett., **63**, 1768(1989);
Nucl. Phys., **B337**, 181(1990).
- [4] Y. Iwasaki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3343(1991).
- [5] B. Svetitsky and L. G. Yaffe, Nucl. Phys. **B210**, 423(1982).
- [6] F.R.Brown, Phys. Lett. **B224**, 412(1989);
M. Fukugita, M. Okawa, Phys. Rev. Lett., **63**, 13(1989).
- [7] S. Gupta, A. Irbach, B. Pettersson, R. V. Gavai and F. Karsch, Nucl.
Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 199(1990).
- [8] B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rep., **132**, 1(1986).
- [9] M. Creutz, Phys. Rev., **D15**, 1128(1977),
V. Alessandrini and ph. Boucaud, Nucl. Phys. **B235**, 599(1984).
- [10] There is some difference between our definition of S_{eff}^W and eq.(3) from
reference [8] because here we integrate over U in order to obtain the
effective spin model. Therefore we do not write S_{eff}^W as a function of
 $Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}$. However we shall show later that our S_{eff}^W is also dependent only
on $Tr W_{\mathbf{n}}$.

- [11] R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965;
J. M. Drouffe and J. B. Zuber, Phys. Rep.102,1(1983).
- [12] For $N_\tau = 1$, the idea which S_{eff}^W depends only on TrW was discussed by M. Ogilvie, Phys. Rev. Lett., **52**,1369(1984).
- [13] M. Okawa, Phys. Rev. Lett., **60**,1805(1988);
K. M. Bitar, Nucl. Phys., **B300**[FS22],61(1988).
- [14] There exist non-nearest coupling terms in the Potts model, although the range is exponentially short. Our results are not in contradiction with such results because we have used the $SU(N)$ matrix and not the $Z(N)$ spin in our calculations.
- [15] Z. K. Zhu and D. H. Feng, Phys. Rev. D48, 397(1993).